

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

WEB-954-US EXAM	1733
EXAM	IINER
COCKS, JOSIAH C	
ARTUNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•	ART UNIT 3749 TE MAII ED: 11/21/200

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		N
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/735,584	SCHLOSSER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Josiah Cocks	3749
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory provided in the second state of th	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNI FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	18 August 2006.	•
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for all	owance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice und	der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.E	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		•
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the applica	ation.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	ndrawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		•
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □		·
Applicant may not request that any objection to	•	• •
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
·	o Examinor. Note the attached	4 OHIOC / KOROTI OF TOTAL TO 102.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 H S C 4	S 119(a)-(d) or (f)
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eigh phonty under 55 0.5.6.	3 119(a)-(d) 01 (1).
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docun		Application No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		
application from the International Bu	ıreau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	·
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	a list of the certified copies not	received.
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 	B) Paper No(5) Notice of I	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Receipt of applicant's amendment filed 8/18/2006 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,158,330 to Andress ("Andress") in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,253,834 to Volks ("Volks").

Art Unit: 3749

Andress discloses in the specification and Figs. 1-3 an invention in the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention and similar to that described in applicant's claims 1-31. In particular, Andress shows a removable cooking grid/grate for a barbecue grill that includes a cooking surface made of upper surface (12) of a plurality of cooking members (17) and a lower surface (14) that includes a solid energy receptor portion (troughs 13, see Fig. 3) having a thickness that extends a distance below the cooking surface. The cooking members of the upper surface are considered to be depending from the solid energy receptor portion. Pluralities of openings (16) are arranged between the cooking members and no openings extend through the solid energy receptor portion (note Fig. 3. showing no openings in the troughs 13). Andress further shows that an upper sloped grease control structure configured on the upper surface of the receptor portion (note slope of sides of members 17) and a lower grease control portion that includes an apex located below the cooking surface (see apexes formed between troughs 18, Fig. 2a).

In regard to claims 2, 10, and 16-20, the cooking grate of Andress clearly has a mass notes that the type of material employed or amount of material has an effect on the weight of the grate (see col. 2, lines 35-39). Further, Andress suggests that the size and shape of the openings are variable (see col. 1, lines 39-41 and col. 2, lines 30-32). To have adjusted the mass distribution of the grate or the size of the openings would be simply a matter of optimizing the mass of the grate and slot sizes of Andress as desired through routine experimentation and are not regarded to patentably distinguish applicant's invention. See MPEP 2144.04(II)(A).

Andress clearly teaches that the cooking grate is included in a barbecue grill assembly that has a cooking chamber and a heating source underneath the grate (see col. 1, lines 12-15) but

does not expressly provide that the heating source is a gas burner and that the cooking grate is adjacent the gas burner such that no structure is located between the gas burner and the solid energy receptor portion of the cooking grate.

Volks teaches a barbecue grill assembly with a cooking grate in the same field of endeavor as both applicant's invention and Andress. In Volks, the barbecue grill expressly includes a gas burner (any or all of 10) within a cooking chamber. The cooking grate (31) of Volks is of similar construction and arrangement to that of Andress and is shown provided adjacent the gas burners such that no structure is between the cooking grate and gas burners (see Fig. 4).

Therefore, in regard to claims 1-31, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the heat source provided underneath the cooking grate of Andress would be a gas burner arranged adjacent the cooking grate as taught in Volks in order to enable flames from the gas burner to impinge on the cooking grid in order to provide heat to the food cooked thereon while also providing that any grease dripping from the grid is directed to appropriate without dropping on the burner to thereby minimize smoking and unpleasant smells (see Volks, page 2, col. 1, lines 1-19 and col. 1, line 72 through col. 2, line 4).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/18/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant appears to argue that the prior art relied upon by the examiner does not suggest a receptor portion "directly above" the gas burner. The examiner does not agree.

As noted above, Andress expressly provides that the heating source is arranged "underneath" the cooking grate/grid (see Andress, col. 1, lines 12-15). Applicant does not appear to comment on this plain teaching of Andress. Further, the examiner has admitted that Andress does not expressly provide that the heating source is a gas burner. However, the remedy this deficiency, the examiner has turned to Volks. As shown particularly in Fig. 4 of Volks, the heating source in such a cooking device is a gas burner in the form of gas burner pipes (10). These gas burner pipes are clearly and unambiguously arranged beneath an energy receiving portion (31) such that energy receiving portion is "directly above" the gas burner in precisely the same manner both claimed and disclosed by applicant (see Fig. 4). Again, applicant does not appear to comment on this plain and unambiguous disclosure of a gas burner and above located cooking grate as shown in Volks.

Therefore, the evidence of record clearly establishes that a cooking grate, as disclosed in either Andress and Volks, is arranged directly above the heating source, where such a heating source is understood in the art to be a gas burner (see 10 of Volks). Accordingly, applicant's arguments to the contrary are not persuasive. Applicant's claims 1-31 do not patentably distinguish applicant's invention over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Application/Control Number: 10/735,584

Art Unit: 3749

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Page 6

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Josiah Cocks whose telephone number is (571) 272-4874. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

icc

November 6, 2006

JOSIAH COCKS PRIMARY EXAMINER

ART UNIT 3749